



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

41 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XLII No. 23 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1993**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

---

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	Rupertsland	

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, March 10, 1993

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of JoAnne Swayze, Sherri Woods, Joan Rains and others, requesting the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings) consider implementing no-fault auto insurance, capping insurance commissions and bringing other recommendations of the Kopstein report that the government has delayed acting upon.

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Annual Report 1991-92 for Rural Development.

It also gives me great pleasure to table the Annual Report of the Conservation Districts of Manitoba.

### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon 21 adult students from the Business Management Skills Program. They are under the direction of Carolee Batycki. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Also this afternoon from The Maples Collegiate, we have twenty-five Grade 12 students under the direction of Mr. Gordon Boyko. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Chœma).

On behalf of all honourable members, I would like to welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### PANDA Project Manitoba Employment Status

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of 1993, we have lost

over 1,700 jobs in the province of Manitoba. Every day we are getting bad news of further people losing jobs, and it is working out to about 25 people in Manitoba losing their jobs per day out of a seven-day week.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday again, we received the bad news in the confirmation of 80 lost jobs basically being transferred to Montreal and another 60 jobs being lost in the airline industry in Manitoba, it is reported today. We are very concerned about the status of jobs in the transportation industry here in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government: What action have they taken on the PANDA Project, a project that contains 48 people working in the province of Manitoba on computerized processing? What action is this government taking to save the jobs in the PANDA Project at Air Canada?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, once again, in terms of the preamble of the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to point out for him that since August of 1992, there has been a growth of some 12,000 jobs in the province of Manitoba, one of the highest growth rates of all provinces from within Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the articles and some of the announcements in the last day or two that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) refers to, most notably the one of the Diners Club and enRoute, and the announcement with Canadian Airlines today, clearly, I think, anybody who is involved in the whole review of the airline industry within Canada recognizes that there are going to be some adjustments and consolidations. The key is that we are always a part of these things, and that we will win more than we will lose. I can assure you that will be the case.

It is interesting to note that we do not get a question from the Leader of the Opposition when Unitel announces that they are going to bring 400 jobs to Manitoba. We do not get a question from the Leader of the Opposition when Canada Post announced that they are going to bring 100 jobs to Manitoba. We do not get a question from the Leader of the Opposition when Monsanto

announces that they chose Manitoba over 100 locations throughout the world.

We are in ongoing contact with Air Canada, with Canadian, with the railway companies in Canada, and will continue to do so.

\* (1335)

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps if we were not losing 1,000 jobs in the Manitoba Telephone System with 400 jobs in Unitel, with a 600 job loss, we would be more positive on this side of the House.

When we lose 162 jobs in rural Manitoba in rural post offices and then gain 100 jobs with a photo opportunity of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister in Winnipeg, we still think we are down 62 jobs, and we are still worried about that.

The specific question I raise, as usual, was not answered by the government on the PANDA Project and the 48 people who are trying to find out their fate in terms of their families and their opportunities, high-tech jobs in Manitoba.

### **Gemini Reservation Systems Manitoba Employment Status**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a further question to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey). Early this year there were hearings from the Competition Bureau dealing with the Gemini application, some 200 high-tech jobs in Manitoba that are serviced by value-added jobs out of Unisys in terms of maintenance of those computers.

What action or position did the government take on the Competition Bureau hearings that took place over the last couple of months on Gemini jobs?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Once again, as I indicated, we have been in ongoing contact with the major airlines in Canada, with Air Canada and with Canadian in terms of our concern about retaining those jobs with Gemini here in Manitoba, and we will continue to do that.

Once again the Leader of the Opposition in his preamble talks about the rationalization and the changes that are occurring within industry and business throughout the world. That is the problem with the Leader of the Opposition and the members of his party. They do not recognize that those changes are occurring, will occur anyway, and the kinds of jobs that are being lost or being adjusted that he refers to will be happening anyway because

of the need to compete within Canada and throughout the world in the global economy.

So, in the final analysis, the 400 jobs that we get from Unitel, the 100 jobs that we get from Canada Post are job growth to our province because those other rationalizations would, in fact, occur.

That is a problem that they have always had, the lack of the ability to recognize the need for Manitobans, the need for Canadians to compete within Canada and to compete throughout the world, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Doer:** The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and his other minister of unemployment are happy about the situation where we lose—Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, excuse me, are happy about losing 100 jobs to Montreal and they say, oh, it is going to happen anyway. It is going to happen because of their step-aside approach to dealing with jobs in Manitoba.

You did not answer the question yesterday about the enRoute jobs. You did not answer the first question on PANDA jobs. You did not answer the second question on Gemini jobs. The Manitoba government has asked for intervener status at the National Transportation hearings scheduled in Calgary on the 22nd of this month.

### **Government Position**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I would ask a very specific question for any minister who could give the people of Manitoba an answer. What is the position of the provincial government on the Gemini situation in Manitoba?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) that we continue to work with Air Canada to see that those jobs are in fact retained here in Manitoba, and once again, the kinds of suggestions that the Leader of the Opposition makes—he refers to minister of unemployment—well, there is the tax man in Manitoba sitting across the way who has answered every situation as, tax Manitobans more, tax them continually, increase personal income taxes, increase taxes to business, increase taxes to corporations.

They think they have the answer through short-term, make-work projects, instead of real wealth in Manitoba, long-term growths being established by companies like Unitel, by Canada Post, by Monsanto. Jobs that are here today, they

will be here tomorrow and they will be here 10 years from now, unlike the kind of management that we saw under that party when they were in government.

### **Port of Churchill Arctic Bridge Project Status**

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this government does not have a position on those jobs.

Dealing with jobs and job opportunities, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger). The hopes of the residents of Churchill were raised last month with the announcement by this government that they had signed, or had agreed to export 500,000 metric tons of grain to Russia.

It now appears that this agreement is in jeopardy. There is a fair amount of confusion out amongst the residents of Churchill and, of course, amongst the residents of this province.

Will the Minister of Transportation provide some clarification on the status of this agreement that this government has agreed to with the Russian government? Will the Port of Churchill export at least 500,000 metric tons of grain through that port this coming shipping season?

\* (1340)

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the member refers to an Arctic Bridge agreement that was initiated by this government, under the leadership of our Premier (Mr. Filmon) and our Minister of I, T and T (Mr. Stefanson), when there was a recent visit to what is now the new Russia or part of the old Soviet Union.

The agreement that was signed under the Arctic Bridge was to look for enhanced opportunities for the use of the Port of Churchill and the bayline that would transport product to that.

The grain negotiations that took place, or the discussions that took place, were directly between the Murmansk region, which was headed by Mr. Klimov and Mr. Kuramin to discuss with the Canadian Wheat Board a potential wheat sale.

That was not the provincial government. That was the jurisdiction from Russia discussing with the Wheat Board a potential grain sale.

We certainly would be very supportive of it, and are very supportive of it, but those negotiations, Mr.

Speaker, are taking place directly between the Wheat Board and the Russian jurisdiction.

### **Port of Churchill CN Rail Discussions**

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, now that the National Transportation Act Review Commission has reported, giving the railways the opportunity to abandon rail lines at their discretion, and since the Wheat Board has indicated earlier this year that CN will only be able to move 300,000 metric tons to Churchill, what discussions has this Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) had with CN regarding the inability of CN to meet the export agreement that was hopefully going to see 500,000 metric tons of grain go to Russia this year?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, the member raises the issue of the report that was tabled by the National Transportation Act Review Commission yesterday, and then he changes over to the Churchill aspect of it. I do not know which question he wants answered, but I would like to just maybe—[interjection]

In 1987, the federal Transportation Act was passed and there was legislative requirement in there to have a review done within five years. A commission was established, did their review last year, and that report was tabled yesterday.

I just want to add that our province, myself, made a submission to that commission, a copy of which I think I tabled last year at that time, a very extensive submission that we made putting forward Manitoba's position in terms of all modes of transportation for the future. This information is available to all members if they want to have a look at exactly what the position was that we put forward.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there is no commitment to ship grain through Churchill this season.

### **Government Plan**

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** My final supplementary is to the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

Given that the Port of Churchill represents a hundred million dollars per year in annual business for this province with the Northwest Territories, what plans does this government, anybody in this government, Mr. Speaker, have to ensure that that

business stays in the province of Manitoba and that business is not lost to the St. Lawrence ports?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, I think my position, as well as my government's position, has been very clear in terms of our support for the Port of Churchill, in spite of the difficulty and the disappointing action that has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very positive, after meeting with the Russian delegation that was out here and the agreement that was signed under the Arctic Bridge concept, plus the statements that they made regarding the negotiations they had with the Wheat Board, I feel that this is the option we need for Churchill, for the guaranteed future of Churchill.

If there is going to be a commitment of 500 million tonnes by the Russians, I want to assure you that we will make sure CN delivers that grain through that port. [interjection]

\* (1345)

### Income Security—Financial Assistance GED Examinations

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, they are just going to have to wait until June 5.

There has been an attitude displayed, unfortunately, by this government that education is not of value. That attitude is expressed, very vocal terms, by significant cuts to education K-12 and education at post-secondary levels. It appears that the Minister of Family Services is also prepared to contribute to cuts in education.

Can the Minister of Education tell this House why Income Security is unwilling to provide the fees for a single mother on welfare to write the GED examination?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to clarify that for the Leader of second opposition party.

The Department of Family Services does provide support for individuals on social allowances who want to get back into the workforce, through a variety of programs. The department also supports the GED program, if in fact the recipient comes forward and takes part in discussions towards a plan of where the GED exams are going to lead them.

The GED exams are the general equivalency of Grade 12. Many Manitobans have used that route,

if they have been out of school for a number of years, to get Grade 12 equivalency to go on to another training program. So if there is another training program in the offing, then the social allowances portion of my department will support the GED exams.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, then will the minister explain why the branch of Income Security informed my researcher today that they would not pay the \$42 for this woman to repeat her GED examination? She failed one course by one point. They will not pay the \$42 because, quote: She does not have a consistent comprehensive life plan.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of discussions that the research department of the Liberal Party has had with members of the branch of my department. I would assure the member that we would see that all individuals who wish to access that would receive fair treatment under the program and the regulations that we have in place.

### Department of Family Services 1993 Program Cutbacks

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we have consistently watched the Department of Family Services cutting back from funding to single-parent welfare recipients. Can the minister tell us if there will be additional cutbacks of those program initiatives for the 1993 year?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** Mr. Speaker, let me correct the Leader of the Liberal Party. The Department of Family Services has seen tremendous increases, not only in the volume of people we have served over the last number of budgets, but also in the amount of funds that we provide to those Manitobans who require the safety net that this department offers. I am hoping that we will get into further discussions of that in our Estimates process which I think is forthcoming in the near future.

### Community Development Branch Staff Layoffs

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development stated at a staff seminar that the Department of Rural Development is undertaking a new direction and that the department is an important player to help rejuvenate rural Manitoba.

My question for the Minister of Rural Development: Can the minister tell this House how the layoff of 19 people in the Community Development branch will affect the vital role that he claims his department is playing in rural Manitoba?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, I first of all would like to thank the member for his question. He is the new critic for Rural Development.

First of all, I guess I would have to indicate that yes, his information about my comments at a strategic planning session that was held about a week ago are accurate in that Rural Development does have a key role to play in the revitalization of the economy of rural Manitoba.

The Department of Rural Development has done some very creative and innovative things with regard to assisting communities in rural Manitoba become revitalized and to those credits, Mr. Speaker, I would have to point to programs like the Community Round Tables that we have throughout rural Manitoba where people from within the community are gathering together to develop their strategic plan for their local area. In addition, we have also identified programs like the Rural Economic Development Initiative program and the Grow Bonds program which add significantly to the contribution in economic development in rural Manitoba.

\* (1350)

#### **Grow Bonds Office—Altona Staff Transfer**

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** The minister did not as usual answer the question of the 19 jobs that are being cut, Mr. Speaker, and he talks about Grow Bonds. Can this minister confirm that staff within the Grow Bonds program have or will be transferred from Altona to Winnipeg?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the critic for Rural Development that is his first question he has posed and his accusation of not coming forward with the answers is not quite accurate.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Grow Bonds program, there are no plans, to my knowledge, of transferring staff from Altona to Winnipeg. We decentralized the staff to Altona; that is the headquarters of the Grow Bonds office. That is

where the office is operating from. There are no plans at this time to relocate those staff to Winnipeg.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the minister perhaps talk to staff who have indicated that move.

#### **Decentralization Government Initiatives**

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, this government talks about decentralization initiative, rural rejuvenation and then lays off staff or transfers them away from rural areas where they are mostly needed. I want to ask the minister: With nine of the 19 jobs, layoffs that are leaving rural Manitoba, how will this affect this government's future decentralization initiative that he claims that they have?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, this government has a commitment to decentralizing government jobs to rural Manitoba, and I think we have indicated by the number of jobs we have decentralized to rural Manitoba that indeed we are serious about it. We have decentralized something like 700 jobs to rural Manitoba, but when you do a budget process there are adjustments that take place. Just because we have decentralized government jobs to rural Manitoba does not mean that they are immune from the budgetary decisions that have to be made. Let me indicate that we still have some commitments with regard to the announcement that was made with decentralization; we have something in the order of 100 or 120 jobs to decentralize and indeed we are working towards that goal.

#### **Dairy Quotas—Amalgamation Government Position**

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, there is another group of people in rural Manitoba that is concerned about the action of this government. Cream producers have met many concerns about the reduction in their cream quota. They feel that their livelihoods are being threatened, particularly since they learned that the Milk Marketing Board is taking steps to amalgamate the cream and milk quota.

There are 750 cream producers in Manitoba, five creameries which create a lot of revenue. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he supports the steps that the Milk Marketing Board is taking to amalgamate these two quotas.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, indeed the issue that the member raises is a very serious issue because certainly there are changes occurring in the consumers' preference of what they want to consume. They went from whole milk to 2 percent milk to 1 percent milk to skim milk, which means that the industry needs less cream. The milk producers of this country control the allocation of quota on a national basis, on a provincial basis.

The Milk Marketing Board in Manitoba has gone around Manitoba and had a wide-ranging, wide variety of meetings to talk about the issue and the reality of the marketplace that they are facing, and trying to get people to convert from cream production into milk production. The options have been there for some time and the board has worked hard to get people to convert over to the kind of commodity the consumer wants to buy in this province and in this country.

### Public Input

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** The minister says diets are changing, purchasing habits are changing. That may be true, but there is still a great demand for cream and small creameries are not even being able to meet their quota of butterfat that they have for sale. The minister said there has been public input, but the producers say they have not had a chance for input.

Will he go back and insist that there be public hearings so that those cream producers, those 750 people who are going to have their income gouged from them, will have a chance for input into this?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** I am very encouraged that the member did acknowledge there is change. Let me tell the member that change is more dramatic than she even realizes, because there is enough skim off—[interjection] Well, Mr. Speaker, she asked the question, I listened. Would she please give me the courtesy of listening to the answer, because I am giving her the facts that exist in the industry.

The milk that is produced in this province by milk producers, there is enough skim off of cream to satisfy the cream demand by and large. The Milk Marketing Board, they have a cream advisory committee. They have sent letters of information to all those producers she mentioned. They have sent them letters of information. They have also asked them to come to meetings, and the board has had

meetings widely spread across this province. These are people elected by the milk producers, cream producers of this province to represent them, and they are doing a very good job of doing that. I am disappointed that member does not agree with that.

\* (1355)

### Manitoba Farming Community Elimination

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, the cream producers are not having an input. Will the minister admit that this is going to get rid of many small farmers and this falls in line exactly with his thinking when he has said many times there are too many farmers in Manitoba and we should not have as many? We are going to lose farmers and this government has no economic—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am really disappointed that member has degenerated to that point that she puts false information on the record—absolute false information. I go around this province talking about opportunity, diversification, value added, produce more of higher value and sell it to the consumers around this province and this world. That member was at an Agri-Food Forum in Portage where that is all people talked about. She better wake up to the reality that the farmers are adjusting and regardless of what she wants, to live in the old-think way. She is in the old-think, she does not want to respond as the producers of this province are responding to what the consumer wants. I wish she would pay attention to what is really going on.

### Headingley Jail Media Attention

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Justice.

Yesterday the minister indicated that the abuse of temporary absences was simply to relieve pressure, in response to complaints about relieving pressure at Headingley Jail, by the abuse of temporary absences. He suggested this was simply the result of a few disgruntled employees who were running to people like myself and members of the media, Mr. Speaker.

Interestingly, that view was parroted by the Acting Superintendent at Headingley, Mr. Larry Krockner,



who was so concerned about this that on February 8, 1993, he wrote to staff saying: The media's bias often seems to be in favour of conflict. It appears that it is the media's impression that conflict and sensational headlines sell papers. Given this situation, it serves the media to present Headingley in a negative light. On a positive note, remember, the media and the public have a short attention span.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the Acting Minister of Justice: Is this the government's hope, to deflect negative publicity about giving, for instance, a man convicted of domestic assault only six nights in jail out of a 90-day sentence? Is this their hope, that the public has a short attention span?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, as the acting minister, I will take the question as notice, specific to the specific issue he has brought forward, but I do not know now whether the member for St. James is now on the same side of the issue as the Minister of Justice or on the other side.

Let me say that governments everywhere of course like to deflect negative attention. There is nothing new in that type of reaction.

I will take the question as notice.

### Bed Requirements

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, again, for the acting minister: Why is it that in the last two years, Headingley Jail has gone from having a capacity of over 400 to approximately 280 to 290, roughly 127 beds have been cut out in the last two years, approximately one-third?

There is no corresponding increase in rehabilitative services in the community. There is no corresponding decrease in the crime rate. How is it that we have now only a need for two-thirds of the rate that we had two years ago? What has happened to the people who were otherwise—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, in no way do I accept the facts as presented by the member opposite. He has a long tradition of sometimes missing the mark.

Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice for the Minister of Justice.

\* (1400)

### Dormitory Closure

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, finally, for the same minister: Can the minister indicate to the House whether or not currently a further two dorms at Headingley Jail, another 32 beds, dorms 3 and 4 with 16 beds each, are contemplated being closed? Can the minister indicate to the House when it is anticipated that those dorms are going to be closed?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine the Estimates of the Department of Justice will be coming not too distant, and the member then will have an answer to that question.

### Economic Policies Government Position

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, in last year's budget statement the Minister of Finance said that Manitoba, and I quote, was ready for recovery. He spoke of new incentives to strengthen economic renewal and job creation in the province. The minister predicted in this document that the employment level would grow by 1.1 percent, but instead of growing by 1.1 percent it has actually declined by 2 percent. In fact, we lost 10,000 jobs in 1992 alone. He also predicted that the unemployment rate would be 8.7 percent in 1992, but instead it rose to an all-time high, since these surveys have been conducted, to 9.6 percent, the highest it has been since the Great Depression of the Dirty Thirties.

Mr. Speaker, will this Minister of Finance now admit that his rosy predictions were wrong, totally wrong, and that his economic policies are not working?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it may come as some surprise to members opposite, I will not admit that.

The member talks about my predictions. Again I state, for anybody who wants to listen, Mr. Speaker, that my methodology around forecasting is the same as we inherited from the former government, and that is, we take the seven leading forecasting agencies across the country, we take their numbers and we do a simple average and we present that number in our budget. Nothing has changed I believe in this province for the last 10 or 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago, when we brought down the budget, we sensed that there would be national growth in the range of 2.5 to 3 percent. That now has been scaled back for the country as a whole, into the area of 1.5 to 1.75 percent. That was 1992 growth. I say to the members, obviously we are a part of the nation and our numbers accordingly have been reduced in keeping indeed with every other province in the country.

### **Manufacturing Investment 1992 Decline**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance explain why manufacturing investment in 1992 actually declined by 8.1 percent, whereas the minister predicted in his budget statement that it would increase by 31.2 percent? There is a long way between a 31.2 percent increase and an 8.1 percent decline. Where is the leadership of the Economic Development Board of Cabinet? Can he explain why this is happening?

I might add, Mr. Speaker, in terms of manufacturing, we lost 4,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector alone in 1992.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, again, the numbers that I presented were simple averages of forecasts that had been presented. Indeed, in this case that was a Statistics Canada intention number as I recall.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to reflect on '92, this is what happened. Growth in manufacturing capital in 1992 is expected to be over 50 percent up from '91. Again, this is the best growth rate in Canada and compares very favourably to the expected national decline of 4.2 percent. Why does the member not put all the facts on the record?

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** In due course, Mr. Speaker, we will put all the facts on the record.

### **Private Investment Spending Budget Predictions**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I have an other supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

This government prides itself on stimulating private investment spending. Why did private investment spending in Manitoba in 1992 only increase by one-half of 1 percent and not the 7.4

percent which this minister predicted in his budget? Obviously, this policy of reducing the size of government, cutting spending is not working. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this government is making matters worse.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I missed the mark for the very same reasons I did in the other two areas. I accepted the forecasts. They were not my own. I accepted the forecasts as brought forward by outside agencies, as is the methodology in place that the department has used for several years—no different than when his colleagues used to bring down the budget for the province of Manitoba.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, though, in case the member has not recognized it, the reason that private investment did not increase at the rate as we had forecast and we hoped would result was that the national recession lasted longer than indeed everybody thought it would. Of course, that has manifested itself in other ways in a sense of revenue reductions to government that is now causing us great difficulty as we budget towards 1993.

### **Manitoba Intercultural Council Act Repeal**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, on February 4 this year, the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism released the long-awaited Don Blair report whose first and major recommendation is to repeal The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act.

Does the minister agree with this recommendation, that The MIC Act be repealed, because and as I quote from Mr. Blair's report, there is no compelling reason for the MIC to need to be constituted by legislation today?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable friend across the way for asking that question.

Indeed, we did commission Don Blair to do a report on the status of the Manitoba Intercultural Council and what the future should be. He has recommended, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the recommendation, in fact, that the Manitoba Intercultural Council should now be turned over to the community. I know that both opposition parties in the House in the past have asked this government to remove perceived political interference in board appointments to the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

I think there was legislation, in fact, that was introduced by the opposition parties and supported by the opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker, we are removing any perception of political interference and letting the Manitoba Intercultural Council be completely run by the community.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this minister who has politicized this whole process talks about taking it out of political process.

### **Manitoba Intercultural Council Conference Recommendations**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism agree that she will follow the recommendations of the biennial MIC conference to be held in mid-April, even if those recommendations say to retain the Manitoba Intercultural Council or has she already drafted legislation that will kill the MIC?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship):** Mr. Speaker, there is not any piece of legislation or nonlegislation, in fact, that can prevent a community organization from operating in any way they see fit to serve the community that they represent. I welcome the MIC's biennial assembly in April, look forward to hearing their recommendations and look forward to the way they believe the Manitoba Intercultural Council should operate into the future.

\* (1410)

### **Bill 16—The Public Schools Amendment Act Government Justification**

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** It is well known that this government has undertaken unprecedented cuts in public education, as has been shown in this House and announced earlier, as well as a massive intrusion into the decision making of school boards that we see through Bill 16. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we were treated to the mind-boggling sight of this minister refusing to answer questions about her bill when it was tabled in the House from myself as critic, a matter which you have taken under consideration.

I want to ask the minister today now whether she can justify what she said yesterday in introducing the bill for second reading when she said "the bill is fair and equitable to both school divisions and

taxpayers;" when under this government's policy some school divisions, Mr. Speaker, would have to cut their special levy by significant amounts when others could increase that special levy to homeowners by 8 or 10 percent.

How is that fair and equitable by this government?

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer the question. Yesterday, my honourable friend was not really prepared to speak. So I am glad that he has been able to take the opportunity at the briefing offered by my office to acquaint him with my bill so that now he is able to put questions forward.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

### **Point of Order**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, as we raised yesterday, on a point of order, I have never seen a minister refuse to answer questions on second reading. We will debate the bill when she answers the questions, which every other minister I have seen in 11 years—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member clearly does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

The honourable Madam Minister, to finish her response.

\* \* \*

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Speaker, I did say yesterday, when I had the opportunity to introduce Bill 16, that it is fair and equitable to both school divisions and to taxpayers. It is fairness to taxpayers because it is limiting in the amount of the special levy that is able to be raised. It is fair and equitable to school divisions because it provides the same 2 percent cap on the special requirement, that is the amount of money required for a school year by a school division. It provides the same equitable cap.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously does not understand this even though she had a briefing this morning for herself.

### **Government Flexibility**

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Is the minister prepared to allow some flexibility in this bill, so that it would apply to either the special levy or the special requirement, whichever would yield the most dollars for the school divisions, because some divisions will

be able to increase the special levy by 8 or 10 percent? Lakeshore, Seine River and others would have to cut their special levy significantly. How is that fair and equitable?

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that it is the honourable member who does not understand the function, and it is the honourable member who does not understand the impact.

In fairness to school divisions, the 2 percent cap was placed on the special requirement, that is the dollar amount required. The special levy, as the member would know if he did take the opportunity to attend the briefing I had arranged for him this morning and he was not able to attend, yields different amounts across different divisions. That, Mr. Speaker, would be unfair.

### School Board Compliance

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, the minister undertook a little damage control this morning, a little political action to try and recover from yesterday's disaster in this House.

Mr. Speaker, since we have not received any answers from this minister, we have not seen any answers in the House in great form by this minister. Since the minister—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Question, please, now.

**Mr. Plohman:** If the minister wants to intrude on the actions of school boards in this way, is this minister planning to fire school boards that do not comply with her actions and in fact put in place trustees to carry out the will—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, in making this announcement we did want to ensure, No. 1, fairness for taxpayers. We did want to protect the taxpayers, something that the other side has only encouraged us to continue to allow taxes to rise and rise across this province. We made sure that we did put into place a 2 percent cap.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we also made sure that school divisions had in place the tools to deal with their financial situation. We did recommend that school divisions might look at a voluntary workweek reduction and also a reduction in their own

administrative costs, not to affect students and the classroom.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### Nonpolitical Statements

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Mrs. McIntosh:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly share with the members a piece of good news. The Consumers' Association of Canada, the Manitoba branch, has recently received the Margaret Speechly Stansfield Memorial Award.

This is a \$2,000 award which they will use to buy a computer and software to help CAC with its product information service in grocery price surveys.

My department enjoys a long-standing working relationship with CAC. In fact, Margaret Stansfield was the first recipient of Manitoba's Consumer Education Award of Excellence in 1986. She was an active volunteer in the consumer awareness movement for over 40 years.

I am very pleased that the Manitoba branch of the Consumers' Association of Canada has received this award and the support that goes with it. It is a very fitting acknowledgement of their contribution to our community.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable Madam Minister that nonpolitical statements are reserved for members to make a nonpolitical statement. It appears by the honourable Madam Minister's statement that her department has some involvement.

Honourable Madam Minister, just clarify, please.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** The Manitoba Consumers' Association is a voluntary nonprofit organization that does volunteer work for the public, shares that information with wide groups. We also get information from that group.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the honourable Madam Minister. It appeared that the honourable minister's department was involved.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the honourable member have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

**Ms. Cerilli:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two exemplary Manitobans this afternoon. They are both going to be representing Manitoba, and indeed all of Canada, at the World Indoor Championships for Track and Field in Toronto this weekend.

Their names are Byron Goodwin and Alanna Yakiwchuk. Both of them are athletes from Manitoba who have benefited from years of hard work in coaching. I think it should be recognized that they have progressed to not only be successful at the national level, but they are both entering the world stage in track and field at this time.

I think we should all recognize that, in this day and age, hard work and dedication still pays off, and that they should be commended, as well as the coaches, the trainers, the volunteers that will be going to Toronto with them. Thank you.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### House Business

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make some announcements with respect to committees. I would like to call the Standing Committee on Economic Development to meet on Thursday, March 18, 1993, at 10 a.m., to consider the 1992 Annual Report of Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts will meet on Thursday, March 18, 1993, at 10 a.m., to continue to consider Volume 3, 1991 Public Accounts, Volumes 1, 2 and 3, 1992 Public Accounts, and the 1992 Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor.

I would also announce that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will meet on Thursday, March 25, 1993, at 10 a.m., to continue to consider the 1991 Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board, and the 1992 Five Year Operating Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if you could please call for second reading of Bill 15, The Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act, and then I would ask, Sir, if you could please call for a continuation on debate on second readings the bills as listed on the Order Paper.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

## SECOND READINGS

### Bill 15—The Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** I am pleased to move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that Bill 15, The Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act (Loi sur la Commission de la boxe et de la lutte) be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

#### Motion presented.

**Mr. Stefanson:** I am pleased to rise to say a few words about this particular act. The proposed new Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act is aimed at providing more effective regulation of professional boxing and wrestling here in the province of Manitoba.

The fundamental objectives are to promote the safety of the contestants and to protect the public interest. I am pleased to report that the proposed legislation was developed after consultations with the boxing and wrestling industry, with the Manitoba Sports Directorate and with the Department of Justice.

In addition, similar legislation from other jurisdictions was carefully reviewed when the new legislation was being developed. The new act responds to recommendations made by the Provincial Auditor as well. The proposed legislation incorporates changes which are quite substantive.

\* (1420)

The distinction in the existing act between personal licences and event permits is unclear. The new act clarifies the licensing provisions. It clearly distinguishes between the two types of licences which are issued in practice, that is, personal licences for contestants, promoters and other participants and event permits for specific events.

In support of applications for licences, information including medical information will be required by the commission. Applicants for licences will also be required to provide information to prove their identity, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The proposed legislation responds to recommendations made by the Provincial Auditor regarding the posting of security and the levying of

fees. Promoters will be given more flexibility regarding the form of security that they provide.

The proposed legislation will also permit the commission to levy a flat fee in certain circumstances rather than the standard percentage of gate receipts. Right now the fee relates to a percentage of gate receipts received at an event, a percentage of 3 percent, but in some instances it is more appropriate to levy a flat fee because there are no gate receipts being collected, there is no fee being charged as admission, so to give the commission the flexibility to charge a flat fee covers off both types of aspects.

In the past there have been problems with the enforcement of the existing legislation, and in order to address these problems the proposed legislation provides for significantly increased criminal penalties for breaches of the act.

In addition, the proposed legislation provides the commission with new powers to discipline holders of licences and event permits, and also provides for the appointment of inspectors to assist with the enforcement of the act. The proposed legislation, Madam Deputy Speaker, will provide the commission with expanded regulation-making power which will assist it to achieve its overall mandate. The expanded regulation-making power will enable the commission to make regulations respecting professional boxing and wrestling, including licensing and including information to be provided by third parties and definitions.

The existing legislation provides for the commission to regulate the showing of professional boxing and wrestling contests or exhibitions on closed circuit television. Technology has advanced to the point that it is no longer practical for the commission to regulate closed circuit television. Closed circuit television technology has become outmoded because of the introduction of satellite and television technology. The new act makes no reference to closed circuit television.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, again, I reiterate for members of this House that the new proposed legislation has been developed after consultation with the boxing and wrestling industry, the Manitoba Sports Directorate and the Department of Justice, and it responds to recommendations made by the Provincial Auditor.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there was quite lengthy discussion on the whole issue of whether or not

wrestling should continue to be a part of this act and after consultation with people in the industry, after a review of other jurisdictions, it was deemed that impact wrestling should definitely continue to be a part of this act. The whole issue of professional wrestling and boxing, the greatest concern, as I have already outlined, is the safety of participants and this act goes a long way to enhancing and ensuring the safety of the participants.

Wrestling and boxing, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the province of Manitoba are very significant for several reasons. Obviously, they provide entertainment to the citizens of Manitoba for those who want to go and participate and view such events. They obviously provide job opportunities for many Manitobans in terms of the hosting of these events and the staging of these events. Wrestling events held in Winnipeg Arena draw significant crowds in the many thousands and some of the boxing events that have been held in the province of Manitoba recently, as well, have attracted significant crowds.

As well, both professions, I guess more notably boxing, have also provided some citizens who have brought recognition to the province of Manitoba. In the field of boxing, one Donny Lalonde certainly brought significant recognition to the province of Manitoba, not only for his performance and his ability as a professional boxer, but his fight against child abuse, Madam Deputy Speaker.

So there are several reasons that this is an industry that is important to Manitoba. It is important to the citizens of Manitoba, and it is important to the government of Manitoba. Clearly, it needs to be regulated in a proper and appropriate fashion. It needs to provide safety for the participants, and it needs to ensure protection for the public. Clearly, we feel that the amendments that have been put forward in this act address those issues, Madam Deputy Speaker, building on the act that was in place, and as I have mentioned, addressing some of the concerns of the auditor, particularly as they relate to the amount of security and the type of security that should be put forward for the hosting of any event and, again, to provide some flexibility in terms of the kinds of fees that are charged so that you can charge a fee whether or not there are attendance fees being charged at a particular event or whether or not an event is being held without fees being charged. So the flexibility to charge a

percentage of gate receipts or to charge a flat fee covers that.

So, in the final analysis, after extensive consultation and discussions with many individuals associated with professional wrestling and boxing, we feel that this act really does provide us with the kinds of parameters that are essential in this industry today and therefore I am pleased to commend it to this House.

I hope that the House sees fit to support the intent of the new Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act in an expeditious fashion. I look forward to hearing the comments of other members of the House on this particular piece of legislation, and I thank you for the opportunity to put a few thoughts on the record. Thank you.

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), that debate be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 2—The Endangered Species Amendment Act

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading, Bill 2 (The Endangered Species Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition), standing in the name of the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

**Some Honourable Members:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Stand? Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

\* (1430)

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** Madam Deputy Speaker, the Labour minister made reference to 40 minutes. I want to let him know that I recently purchased a watch, and I have set Mickey's big hand and little hand. At about 10 minutes after three, I should be winding down and concluding my remarks.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this Bill 2 is an amendment to the original bill which was passed by this government back in March of 1990. In fact, the minister, in his remarks in Hansard, points out, and rightly so, that Manitoba is one of three provinces in Canada that has legislation such as this. He goes on to point out that these are minor amendments.

That is, I suppose, typical of what a government minister would say in this regard, because minor amendments oftentimes open the door to major changes, and we have to, as the opposition, be vigilant in that regard. He goes on to say, in his observations, that the amendments of this bill will require the language to be consistent with the federal and, in fact, international treaties and accords that govern the endangered species worldwide.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe it was the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), my colleague on this side of the House, who made the observation that as residents of this planet, we are in fact stewards of our environment, and we can be either good stewards or we can be bad stewards of the environment. I think what we have seen over the last hundred years is a record that one could only indicate is bad stewardship.

One only has to look at the record of the eastern European countries to see that over the last 40 years, they have developed an economy that has paid very little service in the way of any kind of environmental protection or controls. What we see are massive pollution problems. Of course, those pollution problems are not limited to eastern Europe by any stretch. The pollution problems are rampant here in North America in many, many different areas.

What we have seen, finally, and perhaps it is not too late, Madam Deputy Speaker, but what we have seen is a recognition that the pollution problems are substantial and that efforts must be made to clean up the mess that we have in society right now. Of course, we get into arguments within all parties as to how serious the problem is, first of all, and how fast we must go to clean up the problems.

Last year, I was fortunate enough to listen to a speech by Dr. Suzuki from British Columbia. He spent considerable time talking about the world time clock. He was talking about the population growth in this world and, because it is a geometric jump every few years, that we have never seen this many people living in the world. He is saying that within a very short period of time, perhaps as little as 15 or 20 years, the population will again double, and we will have such a pressure on the world that in fact the whole system will collapse.

I know that people who make these predictions and make these observations are oftentimes

dismissed as wild-eyed radicals and not being in touch with reality and being too environmentally conscious, but I think only time will tell whether in fact those accusations are born out. I do not think any of us want to be in a position at the end of the day 15 or 20 years from now when there is really not much left of the world and the ecology in the world, there will be little satisfaction, we will have little satisfaction in being able to say, or they will, that I told you so 15 years before. So I think that we do have to wake up collectively as a society and make certain that we do not do any further unnecessary damage to our environment and to the species that live there.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, once again the realities of the situation and the budgetary constraints and so on of society oftentimes allow us to put off what we should be doing environmentally. We see that in a whole myriad of areas in society where people who live in an area have an economic dependence on a certain type of activity. It is too expensive or not possible for us to redirect their activity in the short run, so we put up with impure environments in that area because we do not want to put these people out of a job.

I say that I am in the middle in this whole area because, while I understand the need for correcting environmental problems, I also understand the need for some sort of balance here and that we cannot possibly cause major disruptions in our society overnight. We should be doing things like phasing out CFCs and taking other measures on a kind of a phase-out sort of basis. I would argue that the acceleration of the phase-out should be perhaps faster than we are doing it, but to outright ban these practices and so on is hard to do politically because of the dislocations that result.

I have always been a rather hopeful person in hoping at the end of the day that what we will find is that people will pull back from the edge before we go over the brink and that the people who are suggesting today that in fact that is where we are headed and that it is inevitable and so on, I hope that they are wrong. I am sure they hope they are wrong too but, in the final analysis, we will not know until it is too late, and that is a problem. There is some really strong evidence that these people are able to produce, to indicate that in fact we may be headed to the point of no return. I draw your attention to the disappearance of literally I believe hundreds of thousands of species of plants, animals

and so on, insects, around the world, and to the extreme interest that people have shown in the loss of the rain forests in South America, which are a major, major concern.

I would caution people, those of us in the House here who may be too quick to identify people as radical environmentalists and so on and dismiss what they have to say out of hand, because what they may be 15 or 20 years from now is viewed as quite visionary for their times.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are many, many ways in which wildlife species are being encroached upon by current society. We saw major oil spills in recent years. We thought that perhaps the tankers and so on were being built in such a way as to minimize, to a great degree, the oil spills, but what has been proven is that major oil spills are occurring around the world. Many oil spills do not get the publicity that the Exxon Valdez did. In fact, I am told that there are hundreds and hundreds of oil spills, some of a more of a minor nature, not as major, happening all over the world every day. These, of course, do not get reported as much as the big ones do. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of these oil spills has a devastating effect on the species of animals that inhabit that particular area.

Another area that we are finding out about little by little, Madam Deputy Speaker, involves the military's basically hiding of waste materials, nuclear waste materials and the like, since the Second World War. We are finding, today, horror stories in cases where both the Americans and the Russians have simply been dumping at sea barge loads of toxic wastes and so on. These barrels are sitting at the bottom of bodies of water, and, in fact, by now perhaps many of the records are lost. So there may be millions and millions of tons of this stuff sitting at the bottom of the seas, leaking out into the water and into the water streams, and we do not know because there are no records left. What we do know is there are many, many examples of records that do exist where these toxic wastes have been literally dumped in the oceans.

What we have found over time is that this practice has been discredited. We cannot say that it is not happening still. We are not absolutely sure. I do not think anyone in this House knows really what the military is up to in any given country. That is why people, certainly in the opposition, have to be vigilant and suspicious of moves on the part of authorities.



\* (1440)

For example, the AECL in Pinawa, I believe, are interested in digging big holes in the rocks of the Canadian Shield and burying things in there. So they may well have a valid case for doing what they are doing, but we have seen these valid cases made before with very devastating results. We have seen military people do a lot of things over the past without telling people what they were doing.

I think that there is a certain positive situation to have developed whereby critics are keeping—and that is nonparliamentary critics as well—a good eye on authorities in this country, such as the military and AECL and government bodies and so on.

The wildlife of the country has been encroached upon. As recently as the Gulf War, we had a deliberate move on the part of a government and a military government leader to light the oil wells on fire in Kuwait. What we saw there was massive destruction of the oil wells and also massive destruction and damage caused to the animal life and the fish life in the area.

We will never know how many years it will take, if ever, for the environment to get back to its former pure state. In fact, I do not know that that is possible at any point now because we have done so much damage over the years. Nature is such a delicate environment that once you throw one piece of it out of whack, the thing is out of whack for good.

That leads me into the area of the whole question of how we are to deal with the species and animals in society. I guess if I was a farmer, all my chickens would die of old age because I could not bear to kill any animals. So I am somewhat sympathetic [interjection] and I will deal with the member's statements. I do say that whenever I see a truckload of chickens going by on the road, I swear off chicken, and then of course I find myself a month later dropping in at the local McDonald's. It is an incremental change that I am going through. I am finding myself, over the years, starting to recognize that I should be eating a little better than I have in the past.

These are good signs that we have done, implemented such things as a drunk driving legislation. We have put bans on smoking and so on. I think that many of us who are sort of part-time smokers, or odd-time smokers, would appreciate a ban in smoking because that would wean us off the

habit for good. I think that some of the areas that we are heading in are good.

I for one, in many respects, like to be directed by the authorities or by the government for my own good. I know that if I am told that smoking would be banned and so on, and that I could not get to the cigarette supply, then I would be just as happy to quit smoking.

Now to deal with my old friend the Minister of Labour's (Mr. Praznik) observations about the meat eating and so on. I am saying that I think part of it is an educational process. Obviously, we are not going to ban the eating of meat, but throughout the last 10 years, with the educational programs on TV and so on, people are starting to think in terms of eating better. I am getting away slowly but surely from the eating of meat. I certainly admit to a slight bit of hypocrisy on the subject still at this point, but I am working at it.

The point is, Madam Deputy Speaker, that while I could not kill farm animals, I recognize that there are legitimate concerns and interests on the other side of the coin, and there are those who are opposed to absolute total ban on experimentation on animals and so on, and I believe wherever possible we should do that. It has been pointed out, and quite legitimately, that if one does not call a herd of whatever type of animal it is, that it may just expand to the point where it becomes a major problem and, for its own good, it has to be dealt with.

So I think there has to be some sort of a balance here. There has to be some sort of a recognition that in fact in certain cases that there may be situations where we may have to deal with killing animals for certain societal goods.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this particular bill that the minister has introduced allows the minister to have some additional authority in dealing with designated animals so that they can allow some scientific experiments. I think that some of us are concerned about how far that could possibly go. The minister in his own comments made reference to a sick animal on the endangered species list that he has, and that he was unable to I believe do anything about the situation because he could not allow any kind of scientific experiments.

So this change giving him additional authority to dealing with designated animals and allowing scientific experiments perhaps is something that may be necessary. We are concerned that it might

be interpreted, and one of the other speakers on this bill in fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, made reference to the fact that Ducks Unlimited, depending on what the definition of a scientific experiment was, which purports to be an office complex could in fact have itself classified under this bill as an experimental location and in fact could engage in scientific experiments.

So we would be very concerned, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the minister, and I have confidence having known this minister for some time, that he has a bit of an independent streak in him and I cannot see him going off in the wrong direction, although perhaps members opposite would have more intimate knowledge and information of where the minister might be headed if one were to give him too much power.

I say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the minister has a list right now and among them I find some of the, certainly, the Latin pronunciations of their names almost impossible, so I take him at his word that these six categories should be included. But perhaps we should be granting the minister authority to add a No. 7 category on that list, and that is the Liberal Party of Manitoba as an endangered species.

I am told today that Natalie Pollock, a well-known Winnipeg personality, is possibly declaring her intention to run as a leadership hopeful. I would say that would put her first on the list at this point. She is certainly better known than any of the other Liberal leadership aspirants. So we may find the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) as the new House leader for the new leader.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** But she does not have a seat.

**Mr. Maloway:** Well, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) says she does not have a seat, but I am sure that one of the six or seven Liberals remaining would be willing to give up his or her seat to allow the new leader, should it be Natalie Pollock, to run in a by-election and to lead the Liberal Party on to greater heights than it has ever seen before under the current membership.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sure there are other species that we could allow the minister to include on the endangered species list. I do not know whether canaries are an endangered species but if they are—I want to get back to the bill because I do not detect a certain great level of joy on the part

of the few Liberals left in the House at the prospect of the aforementioned person being the Leader. The ones who are here are certainly getting a little more animated than they were before.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I do want to say that the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), when he was making his speech on this bill, had an excellent analysis of how the environment and the animals and the species in the environment should coexist.

\* (1450)

He talked about the two fundamentally different ideas that people have regarding the world and its resources. He spoke about how one school of thought is that it is people's right to use the resources as they see fit, and perhaps that developed at a time when in fact it could be argued that the resources were infinite, that the population of the world was much, much smaller than it is right now and that one could see almost an unlimited supply.

I could see how, with the population as small as it was maybe a hundred years ago, that people travelling across Canada in a very limited way through railways or on horseback could think in terms of an unlimited resource. That idea took hold and was passed down from generation to generation, and it has only been, quite frankly, in the last 20 or 30 years in fact that people have recognized that the pollution is in fact catching up with them.

The second view according to the member for Burrows is that we should be good stewards of the environment, and regardless of how unlimited the resource is, that we should try to conserve it. In fact, I can relate to you that the former City Councillor Magnus Eliason, whom I think, Madam Deputy Speaker, you know and served with on the council, was in fact into recycling. I remember, 20 years ago. He had his little compost bin in the back of his home at 791 Wellington Avenue, and he was saving his cans and doing all these things when in fact the rest of us would think that this was a pretty kooky thing to be doing. We never really thought in terms of doing those things back then, but he was thinking in those terms.

I know that there were many people years ago, perhaps because of economic necessity, who had to make certain that the resources lasted as long as they possibly could and, certainly, with the situation the way it is in the world right now, the view that we

should be good stewards as the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) pointed out is not an option anymore, that we through government legislation and perhaps vigilant policing are going to actually have to force people to adopt that view that we have to be good stewards of the environment, because in fact if we do not, what we are going to see is our extinction on a long-term basis.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, [interjection] the member for Inkster is prodding me again. He is reminding me that I have another 15 minutes to go and that I have to speak for 40 minutes. So I am thinking, what can we possibly do here as a group to keep the leadership aspirant, the main leadership contender, the legend in his own mind occupied and entertained for the next 15 minutes?

You know, I have been telling the member for the last little while that there are no delegates in this House. Perhaps he thinks the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) is a potential delegate and supporter of his and perhaps he feels that he has to be here for that purpose. In actual fact, he is finding himself in a position now where Natalie Pollock is out meeting the delegates and tying up the leadership and jumping ahead of him in the race while he is here and he is losing the race in fact.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface):** Yes, if the member wants to discuss leadership, tell him to go out and I will discuss it with him. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Praznik:** Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is rare that I come to the defence of a member of the New Democratic Party, but I believe he was dealing with The Endangered Species Act and was suggesting that it be expanded beyond animals to perhaps other particular issues.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I believe there really is no point of order, that it is a dispute over the facts. I would suggest to the honourable member for Elmwood, indeed, that debate on reading of the bills should be relevant to the bill.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Maloway:** Madam Deputy Speaker, just before I leave the Liberal Party and get back to the text of the speech here, I know that the member for St. Boniface is a potential leadership aspirant himself. When I told the member for Inkster the other day that I was firmly behind his bid, the member for St.

Boniface took it very personally and was very upset and accused me of backing out on my commitments to him. I did not know I had made any commitments to him. So there is definitely some confusion here. In fact, today, with only six or seven members in the entire party, they could not decide who was to ask the first question. It certainly points to some lack of direction and lack of organization in that group over there.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) in her speech on this bill made reference to Ronald Reagan and his activities as the governor of California and so on as President of the United States and, while he was not well known for being a progressive by any stretch, the fact of the matter is that evidently there were measures taken under his leadership as President of the United States which put the United States ahead of us in terms of protection of endangered species. In fact, the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) made reference to the redwoods of California and how the people of California have begun to recognize—while they did not recognize 20 years ago that there was a serious problem with loggers and logging of the redwoods, they came to grips with that problem in California, and they made rules and so on to protect what little is left of the species there.

We are seeing that in British Columbia right now, Madam Deputy Speaker, with the strip mining that is going on there, with the logging that is going on. People have had to resort to very extreme measures to try to force the government to wake up and face the problems of having to sacrifice economic development. It is a very hard thing to do, because our constituents want jobs. We have a very high unemployment rate, and we want to make sure our constituents are employed. So it is a very difficult thing to do, to be put in a position to say that we are not going to allow a mine to open in a jurisdiction and provide all those jobs because we want to keep a wilderness park or we want to keep the environment pristine.

\* (1500)

Madam Deputy Speaker, we are going to have to not succumb to those demands. We are going to have to take steps, arbitrary in some instances, and suffer the economic penalties and simply pull back and allow the parks and so on to be protected. The logging and the loggers will have to look elsewhere for their products.

As a matter of fact, there is a very interesting development over the last few years when we see the recycling of newspapers, how the market now for pure, I believe it is bleached, paper and so on is drying up rather fast and people are, as a matter of practice, demanding recycled paper. In fact, they cannot keep up with the demand. I believe the recycling of newsprint and so on is because most of the newsprint is used up in the United States. To be able to recycle it back into our paper, we would have to truck the stuff back up, the newspapers back up from the United States to put into our recycling bins.

Clearly, there has to be an economic incentive, I believe, in the long term, for recycling to work. As long as there is a—notice when we put a deposit on cans. If the deposit is high enough on cans—I remember the former member for Ellice, Harvey Smith, who was elected back in 1986 and served here for a couple of years—[interjection] and, I believe, served with you on council. He introduced a bill for deposit on cans. The thinking behind it, and it certainly works in other jurisdictions, is that the higher the deposit on cans and so on, the more people are going to collect the bottles, collect the cans, bring them in for a deposit, and the less inclined they will be to throw the cans away and destroy the environment.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have all seen situations, I am sure, on the lakes when you are out boating on the lake where people have thrown cans into the water, old cans and so on. It is absolutely a disgusting situation to be walking along a beach and find that you cannot walk around in bare feet because you are being cut on pieces of glass and bottles and so on that are around. So we have a major, major mess on our hands that has to be cleaned up, and it will take time to do it.

Of course, it is incumbent upon the government to try to work out ways and means to make it both legislatively required that people take care of the environment but also economically advantageous for people to do it, because when people are faced with the problem of having to pay excessive amounts of money because of pollution they are causing and because of problems they are causing, then and only then will they take the effort to walk the extra mile and pick up the mess.

We have also seen on the riverbanks, Madam Deputy Speaker—in fact, people will know that the riverbanks are quite filled. Well, the Minister of

Government Services and Seniors (Mr. Ducharme) is making gestures. You know, I am still waiting for his response from last week on his tendering out of the auditing for the government fleet vehicles. He promised it the next day, this quick minister. Here we are a week later, and we are hearing nothing from him.

It is members like the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) whom I have known for some time—I certainly would suggest to you that he more than likely is a careful sort of individual who would in fact pick up. He has got a cottage at the beach and so on. I am sure that he does not throw cans and bottles and stuff like that around, but we have to collectively teach our young people to be able to do that.

I do not know how much time I have left here, but according to my watch—the government, in introducing this bill—I tell you that we look at the Order Paper and we see very few bills, and I do not know what is wrong with the government. I think perhaps it is a lack of planning or they are tied up in the Estimates process to such an extent that they really cannot come up with much in the way of legislation, but we have seen this now over the last two or three years, and they have been the government in this province now for nearly five years.

What we have seen is very, very limited amount of legislative initiatives on the part of the government. I am not sure why that is. I mean, they just perhaps do not believe in interventionist type of government. I mean that is typical of Conservative governments all over the place that they are not very interventionist by nature. This one has acted a little bit differently from some of the other governments, and perhaps that is why it is still kind of holding on after all this time. The whole thing has not come unglued yet. You know, normally by a year or two in office the whole thing starts falling apart. We are seeing signs of that now, but so far they have held together a little bit.

I think part of that—well, I will deal with him, the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar)—I will deal with the other member in a couple of minutes.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Who is this speech helping, Jim? Is this helping you get something off your chest, or what is it?

**Mr. Maloway:** The Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) who is one heartbeat away from the premiership of this province is starting to chirp from his seat, and the fact of the matter is that member knows that there is very little in the way of legislative initiatives on the part of this government.

There are no more than 10 bills on the whole agenda. [interjection] There are largely bills—the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) is also saying things from his seat, but he should be the first to admit that what we see here, the 10 bills before the House right now, is really very thin as to what they are really doing.

**An Honourable Member:** People are relieved that it is a thin agenda.

**Mr. Maloway:** He says the people are relieved that it is a thin agenda so perhaps their polling machine has determined that perhaps the people do not want—

**An Honourable Member:** They worry less from us on this side than they did with you.

**Mr. Maloway:** The member has some reason to believe that the public wants 10 rather thin bills before the House, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I have no objection to the minister bringing in his so-called minor changes to The Endangered Species Act. It is an important issue and so on, but there are certainly a lot of other issues out there that need to be dealt with, and for the government to be essentially holding off—[interjection] The Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) refers to The Cemeteries Act. Well, you know that is about the speed at which this government has been travelling, and it is headed back into it. I mean what we have seen is very, very limited legislative initiatives by this government, and like I said, maybe its polling should indicate that this is what it should be doing.

With those very few comments—and I know that I am running out of time. I would make some more comments about the Liberals, but I think that perhaps I could leave it to other speakers to rile them up a little bit and get a response from them.

Anyway, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I look forward to coming back tomorrow perhaps, as early as tomorrow, and dealing with Bill, I think it is 3, the next bill on the agenda. Thank you.

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on Bill 2,

dealing with endangered species. I am surprised that there is no one else speaking.

I will start off with just some general comments in relation to this bill. You know, it is interesting that this is such a thin bill. There is so much work to be done in terms of protection of endangered species and their habitat that I think one of the first things that must be stated is that these, as the minister has said, minor amendments to The Endangered Species Act, are of concern because if they are going to open an act, they could really do something positive. They could strengthen a lot of the protection for endangered species and their habitat, like so many groups and organizations have been asking them to do.

The government has signed on to the 12 percent campaign sponsored locally by the Naturalists Society. I think it is common knowledge that they received a failing grade by that organization, by the Endangered Spaces Campaign, in terms of moving forward and implementing the necessary protection measures so that we will indeed have 12 percent of all the different ecosystems protected in Manitoba.

I think it is difficult for people to understand still. I was reminded of this last year, when the government introduced Bill 38 which changed The Wildlife Act, which I will get to in a minute. Even then, it became evident that certain members of this House still do not understand that if you want to protect endangered species, you must protect their habitat.

\* (1510)

There is no point in having protection of owls and foxes and various different kinds of wildlife. If you are going to cut down the trees and mow down all the natural meadow and wetlands, you are not going to have very much success in protecting the wild animals that this kind of legislation refers to. I think that this is an important point to keep in mind, that we cannot separate out endangered species from endangered spaces. The two, as we are being reminded, are interwoven.

It is interesting that the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) would talk about the Liberal Party as an endangered species in Manitoba because, with the research that I have the chance to do—

**An Honourable Member:** You're the endangered species.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I would suggest to the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) that all of us are endangered

species, not because we are politicians and probably the least favoured profession currently in Canada, thanks to the federal Tories I would think, but I think that because we are on a collision course in terms of ecological disaster that people generally, including all wild animals, are endangered species.

I just want to make some comments about that, because I remember a couple of days ago I read in the House—it was International Women's Day—a statement from an international coalition of scientists. There were 99 Nobel prize winners in that coalition, and they predicted with a lot of research to back it up that we only have a couple of decades to avert disaster.

We have to realize that the air quality, the water quality and the soil quality that we depend on to grow our food and to have the oxygen we need to breathe are all being jeopardized because of the effects of industrialization and the kind of scientific and technical—some would say progress—that we have had very rapidly over the last few centuries and that we have lost touch with the natural environment and we have lost touch with understanding that we are in fact dependent on the strength of the connections in the ecosystem, that we are dependent on all of the various ecosystems being maintained for our livelihood and for our continuation as a species.

It is common to hear young children talk about this, because I think that the generation coming up that are now going through school are far and away more knowledgeable about the endangered planet that we live on. They will be quick to talk about how every time an endangered species goes on the list as an endangered species, every time an endangered species becomes extinct, that brings our own extinction that much closer.

A number of people across the House will say that I am just full of gloom and doom, and I think they called me part of a soap opera the other day when I was talking about child abuse and violence against children and street youth, but I take very seriously the threat, and perhaps those of us who have a chance to pay more attention to environment and natural resources issues do that because we have a chance to get more information.

I think that one of the problems with this government is that they have been so incredibly controlling of information that we want to get out to the public so that they can be empowered to act, so that they can be empowered to protect their water

source that is providing water for them and their family and their livestock or their garden. As well, the same thing goes for protecting soil and protecting the air quality in the region where they have to live and breathe, and I get quite concerned with the jokes that are made by the members opposite when we try to raise issues of difficult decisions that need to be made so that we can somehow negotiate a course so that we are not going to have even greater unemployment as we try to do the things that are necessary to curtail the overconsumption of resources that is going on in our world and in our local community.

The Conservative government does not seem to understand that principles of sustainable development mean that you deal with that overconsumption, and that is why things like the NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, are so dangerous, because they are further going to tie us into the North American economy, the U.S. economy, and they are going to force more overconsumption of resources.

That agreement is going to mean that we no longer have the sovereignty over developing legislation so that we can say in this region we have to reduce the number of trees that are cut or the amount of ore that is mined or the amount of fish that is caught. When we lose that sovereignty over Canadian resources because we have signed an agreement that says that we have to provide resources to the U.S. at the previous year's rate, we are asking for a lot of trouble. That is the kind of problem that is forcing endangered species and reducing the habitat that they have to depend on to survive.

If the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) cannot understand the relationship between NAFTA—

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert):** I have no problem understanding your relationship, Marianne. The problem is understanding you, you and your NDP philosophy. Stop teaching us about Marxist-Leninist. Go back to your communist country.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I would suggest that the member for St. Norbert would begin to understand the relationship between trade, overconsumption and destruction of the environment, and it is really not that difficult. [interjection] Oh, a couple of years ago when I

became the Environment critic, that is when I really began to understand the threat to our health because of the elimination of—

**Mr. Laurendeau:** What did the NDP do about it when they were government, Marianne?

**Ms. Cerilli:** Well, the kind of economic policies that reduce species on the planet—

**Mr. Laurendeau:** You do not talk about Manfor during the NDP era.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The kind of economic policies that have been practised by this government and by the federal government which are negligent of providing the kind of protection for wilderness by encouraging business to be able to pollute and not have to provide the proper scrubbers, the proper emission controls, even taxes, so that they will pay the costs that they are requiring by the demand they are putting on the environment.

Those are the kinds of policies that we need to have that are part of an endangered spaces or an endangered species commitment. It is not going to just come from some little act with a few word changes. As I said awhile ago, we do not have that much time. If we really care about having the kind of world that we have enjoyed for our grandchildren, then we have to start acting now. I would suggest that if the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) was really interested in change to protect endangered species, this legislation would have been far more substantial.

I am quite concerned that now we are only talking about indigenous species to Manitoba and not generally any species that happens to now live and thrive in Manitoba.

With the kind of megaproject development that goes on now in Canada, with the kind of forced migration and movement of things like deer, bears, wolves, birds that require wetlands, with the kind of encroachment on their habitat that is forced by development, I do not think it is wise to chop the country up into fictitious, in environmental and ecological terms, political boundaries, Madam Deputy Speaker. Not only do animals not vote, they do not pay attention to our political boundaries, so they do not know if they are in Ontario or in Manitoba. All they are doing is moving so that they might have clean air and some other food supply. I think to start limiting, in an artificial way, what kind

of a region is going to define them as endangered or not is a problem.

\* (1520)

So those are some of the kinds of concerns that I think will be expressed when this bill goes to public hearings.

The definitions that are being encouraged by scientists and by those who are spending a large amount of their time and energy as advocates for a safe environment in ecology, the kind of definitions that these people are putting forward are paying attention to the connections in the ecosystem, and they are starting to give more broad definitions, not narrowing the definitions as this piece of legislation is doing.

We need to start realizing that we are part of the ecosystem, that we are not superior in the sense—we may be more intelligent, sometimes I wonder—[interjection] Well, that was a nice comment from the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry). Thank you very much.

The point I am making is that as the definitions are narrowed, we are ignoring that we are part of the ecosystem and we are not superior. We are dependent on wild animals. We are dependent on the survival of wild ecosystems. I am really concerned about a trend that is happening. It has to do with scientific applications to agriculture and genetic engineering. I am concerned that we are so dramatically changing domestic livestock and farm products, crops, and at the same time we are eliminating the natural habitat and we are eliminating the natural wild species, that we are setting ourselves up to eliminate our own food supply.

What I have been learning about the way that we are changing a lot of the domestic livestock that we rely on for food is that when we move, for example, to develop a type of wheat, durum wheat, which used to have 26 chromosomes and now has 13 chromosomes so that it is rust and pest resistant, that has changed the biochemistry of wheat, and it is making it more difficult for our body to digest it. What that is meaning is we are actually having to spend more calories to digest food. What happens is we then ingest more food to meet those calories. If that food is also high in fat, more of those calories are stored in our body. This may be a bit of a biochemistry lesson for some of the members opposite, but what I am saying is our food is

becoming less nutritious; the food that is being genetically engineered is lacking in enzymes. It is the same thing that is happening to the soil, where the soil is being depleted due to the amount of nitrogen and ammonia from chemical use, and it is affecting the enzyme content. That, in turn, is affecting the enzymes that are in the food that is grown in the soil. Those enzymes are so vital. Even though they are only trace quantities in our bodily systems, they are vital to our being able to digest properly food that we eat.

It is related to something else I learned from a chemist I met with recently, when we were talking about how our bodily systems are changing. What is happening is more and more of the oxygen we take in is having to be used to digest our food, our liver function, and what is happening is less and less of that oxygen is available for our respiratory function. We all know that we need oxygen to breathe, and some would think that this may be related to the increase in respiratory problems like asthma.

**An Honourable Member:** Ozone.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Ozone is a good point raised by the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), plus the fact that radiation, methane gas are affecting the energy systems that we have. What is happening is because the air quality is also decreasing and there are more chemicals in the air, not only is our body requiring more oxygen to meet its bodily functions, but there is less oxygen available in the air. This could also be related to why there is such an increase in cancer and other immune deficiency illnesses which are becoming called the illnesses of the 21st Century. By that, I mean things like AIDS, things like allergies, bronchitis, those kinds of things. When you talk about AIDS, it is quite frightening to start to learn how some of the viruses that we are being exposed to have possibly been mutated by the kinds of chemicals that are being dispersed into the environment.

It is interesting to put this into context of endangered species because as people I hope that we all realize that we are still evolving. It is important to recognize that, just as has happened throughout all of our existence on the planet, our evolution is going to be determined by the state of our environment. Is there enough food? How do we have access to the food? What is the air quality? What is the water quality?

All these things are having an effect, and that process that I just described of how oxygen is being more used in bodily functions, such as detoxing the air that we breathe and detoxing the food that we eat, are causing us to possibly develop a larger liver, because that is one of the organs that deals with toxins. When I was younger, I used to eat a lot of beef liver. I stopped eating beef liver a while ago, but now I have really stopped eating beef liver because I think that studies are showing that a lot of the livestock that we draw liver from is also having to process and oxidize more chemical in the feed that they are given. I am concerned that there are more and more dioxins and toxins in the meat that we eat, and we can look at the way, as I get back to this theme I was just talking about in terms of genetic engineering and domestic animals, these animals are more and more reliant on artificially manufactured feed and they are no longer fed whole grains and natural food and that, in turn, is ingested by us when we eat them.

These are some of the more scientific reasons why people are vegetarian. I, myself, am not a vegetarian, but I have tried to watch the kind of red meat in particular that I ingest because of the large quantities of antibiotics and artificial feed that they are often fed and how that, in turn, can lodge itself in our body and in the fat tissue in our body.

I have to come back to talking a little bit about this government's record on dealing with wildlife issues. I am glad to hear that members opposite are remembering some of the things I am saying. That is good. I would question how this piece of legislation fits in with the legislation on wildlife that the government brought in a few sessions ago when they changed the wildlife management areas to allow development in those wildlife management areas.

I would suggest that now that they have fulfilled their objective by building the office complex in the Oak Hammock Marsh, they would do a favour to endangered species by going back to having development prohibited in wildlife management areas, that if they are really interested in endangered species protection, they would have areas like wildlife management areas prohibiting development, that it is quite embarrassing for a number of people in Manitoba that we now have a wildlife act because of a couple of ministers' desire to have a conference centre in a wildlife management area, that we now have a wildlife act



that means you can put any kind of industry and development in a wildlife management area.

\* (1530)

The other area where this province is sorely lacking in protection of endangered species is in having bird sanctuaries, recognized bird sanctuaries. This province has no high level established bird sanctuaries, and there are a number of birds that are threatened in our province. Again, if they were really serious in doing something about protecting endangered species, we would have a higher number and quality of bird sanctuaries in Manitoba.

This is one of the things I wanted to take a look at, because this has to do specifically with this government's record on endangered species. The government in Manitoba has made disappointing progress, says the World Wildlife Fund on its commitment to save a representative sample of the province's natural regions by the year 2000.

According to the national report on the status of wilderness protection efforts in Canada issued today by the World Wildlife Fund, the 1992 endangered spaces progress report which was released simultaneously in Winnipeg as well as in Ottawa at a news conference notes that Manitoba, along with most other senior Canadian governments, must pick up its pace of wilderness protection efforts if Canada's rich natural diversity is to be preserved.

The members should take note that it is not just me, the little member for Radisson, saying this, that this is coming from world-renowned scientists, from world-recognized environment organizations, and this goes way beyond any local activist. This is the World Wildlife Fund.

To date only one-quarter of the country's natural regions have been represented with the protective areas. Manitoba was awarded a D-grade by the Endangered Spaces report, the grade which ranges from high of an A-minus for the federal government in terrestrial areas only and PEI with a low of a D-minus. Only one of the provinces 12 natural regions has been represented in the protected area.

The government is getting a message loud and clear that they are failing to realize that they have to look both at endangered spaces and endangered species together. This legislation seems to move toward that a little bit.

I was reading here earlier, I do believe, where—if I can find it. [interjection] Yes, I will take my time. There was a reference that recognized that flora and fauna must be included in a definition of endangered species, and that is the important point I was trying to make.

The other thing I want to comment on before I move on a little bit is that there is an incredible amount of paper that is generated. The government spends a lot of money on green and purple booklets, on recycled fibre like this. Unfortunately in these kinds of booklets it is often the only place where they are using that kind of paper, and they are not pushing forward to make sure that that is in every copier machine in the Civil Service.

I am concerned that when it comes to campaigns like the Endangered Spaces Campaign, what this government is really interested in is purely public relations.

I know that, for example, the Sustainable Development round table, I think, received some \$400,000 simply for the contract to develop its material, and when the election comes around, people I think are going to see through a lot of nice purple and green booklets.

They are going to be looking for the kind of changes in legislation, in government programs, the increase in staffing, the increase in money to research and development. That would mean that this government has some real intention to do something about the fact that so many wild animals and habitats are threatened in Manitoba. Recycled paper just is not good enough in purple and green booklets.

I have another interesting article here, and it is an article that was in the October 10, 1992, Free Press: Manitoba endangers its natural spaces.. It talks about the—

**An Honourable Member:** Who wrote it?

**Ms. CerIII:** It was written by Mr. Werier.

It talks about the fact that the province received a D rating from the World Wildlife Fund on meeting its commitment to protect wildlife. One of the criticisms is that there is no criteria for identifying areas to be preserved. One of the other problems is that the staff who would do this kind of work have been eliminated from the Civil Service. We have a real shortage of paid expertise in this province to do the kind of research that is so painstaking and time consuming that is necessary to track animals to

monitor their migratory and feeding routes and to make sure that those areas are going to be protected and that those animals are going to be then protected.

There is also very little data on the flora and fauna of Manitoba. In order to identify for preservation we have to know what we have. That is a point that is made over and over again. We are working in a deficit in Manitoba in terms of research. We do not even know, for example, in the Hudson's Bay watershed area what it is that we could be contaminating and destroying.

One of the things that we are always asking for from this side of the House is that we start having basin-wide reviews when we are looking at water diversions or hydro dams. That just means that we can start to understand what it is that we are doing to our natural environment, because as we put in more dioxins and dam rivers, changing their flow, what we are doing is we are eliminating the micro-organisms that are relied on by the fish to eat. Then you eliminate the fish, and then you eliminate the whales, and then you affect the people who also rely on those animals.

It is that linking and understanding of the linking that supports what I was saying earlier about how every time a species goes on the endangered list or becomes extinct, we are one step closer to our own perilous extinction.

I wanted to look at, a little bit, some of the recommendations from our party task force on Environment and Natural Resources. It deals with a number of areas. It tries to frame our approach to natural resource management in some kind of basic philosophy of ecology. That is really important, because that has not yet happened. I would agree that has not happened yet anywhere in Canada.

Let me see which one I should select to talk about here. I will try this one. The Province of Manitoba should support, in co-operation with native Manitobans, a thorough study of the dynamics of the human population that depends on wildlife, their consumption and use of various species in relation to population size and characteristics in these wildlife species. The object of ensuring rational optimal sustained yield is advocated by other points in the wildlife philosophy.

\* (1540)

This raises the important issue of allowing for the traditional trapping and hunting in the North and in areas that have been shown to—

**An Honourable Member:** You cannot have it both ways.

**Ms. Cerilli:** The member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) says that you cannot have it both ways. These are the kinds of issues that we have to negotiate with. It is not an either/or thing. Aboriginal people for thousands of years in this part of the world had harmonious existence with the natural environment. It is only because of the kind of economy of the European influence that that has been disrupted. It is important to realize that there is no reason why there still cannot be the ability in Manitoba to support the hunting and trapping of wildlife for sustenance of aboriginal people.

Those are the kinds of issues, I think, that it is going to take a government to deal with that has some courage and has the ability to bring together the various sectors of our province, and that is the kind of approach that is necessary. I do not think that is the approach that this government has been taking.

From what I hear, when I talk to various bands—I just got another letter from a band that is concerned that there is a development going in that is going to put more ammonia into the river that they rely on for fishing, and they do not even have information given to them about how to participate in the environmental assessment procedure. That goes back to what I was saying earlier. If this government is interested in protecting endangered species, then they would be interested in supporting the individuals in our province that are going to do that work. They would be more forthcoming with information, with the procedural information, with the factual and research information that would help people intervene in an environmental assessment, so that they could help protect wildlife and habitat in our province.

Over and over again, we are reminded because of various reports in the news from other parts of the world that Canada is somewhat fortunate. We have only had large-scale industrial development in this part of the world for a relatively short period of time, but it is quite appalling to me how quickly we have destroyed so many areas in our part of the world as compared to other parts of the world that have had

large population industrial development for a lot longer than we have.

I do not think that this is something that we should be proud of. I do not believe that this is something that can be, oh, just another cost of being competitive. If being competitive means that we sacrifice wildlife, if it means that we sacrifice the integrity of natural ecosystems, then I think that we better look for some new principles and a new approach to dealing with the economy, because there are not too many more generations that are going to be able to be competitive in that kind of a fashion.

So when this government talks about how a deficit or a debt in a provincial government is mortgaging the future of generations of the province, I would disagree. I would say the kind of economic policy that encourages rampant competition, that encourages unchecked development, that encourages the kind of excess and overconsumption that their policies are encouraging, that that is the kind of problem that is mortgaging the future generations of our province.

I think that is the kind of sentiment that I will leave in closing, that we just do not have the right to endanger species of wildlife. We do not have the right to eliminate those species and the habitat for the generations that are going to come after us. Thank you very much.

### **Bill 3—The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 3 (The Oil and Gas and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant le pétrole et le gaz naturel et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois) standing in the name of the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Stand? Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 5—The Northern Affairs Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 5 (The Northern Affairs Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les affaires du Nord) standing in the name of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

**Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake):** Well, I guess with that greeting, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will make my comments brief and hopefully kind, not like my colleague the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway). I will certainly refrain from taking any further shots at the Liberal Party over here. I mean, I feel we are dealing with an issue. Regardless of the rank and file and belief of the Liberal Party, we can stay within the limits of the bill.

I would like to make some comments on Bill 5, perhaps not just comments on the bill itself or the amendments to the bill, but I feel there are some other issues that this government and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) could undertake to further pursue the needs of the northern communities within this province, their needs that may relate to the road conditions, to the housing, to their access for services.

Northern communities, I am sure we are all aware, are certainly not like the communities in central and southern Manitoba. The fact is that they need an improvement in their living conditions. I think that it would be the responsibility of any government, particularly the government in place now and the minister responsible, to see just how the living conditions and how the communities in northern Manitoba and rural Manitoba can be improved, can expand to a point that people in those communities are able to exist, perhaps not as well as us in central and southern Manitoba, but to a level that is acceptable to the young people and to the people who live in the communities, improve their economic base, improve their educational base, improve their access base.

Madam Deputy Speaker, northern communities, and I feel that roads—I know other members have made comments about the road conditions and how they relate to the northern communities. I may not have in my constituency some of the communities that previous members have discussed in their debate on Bill 5, but I have had the opportunity to go with our northern members on tours and that and see first-hand some of the conditions of the roads, of the housing, of the living conditions that do exist in northern Manitoba.

\* (1550)

Within my constituency, roads, Madam Deputy Speaker, for the northernmost communities, are in need. The conditions of some of the roads that I have travelled on, you could not travel with a

Bombardier on it; you could not travel with a two-wheeled bicycle. The conditions of the roads are absolutely atrocious.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the housing that I have seen in my communities and other northern communities are ones that, I think—this minister and this government should expand The Northern Affairs Act to be able to allow for these northern communities to have the access to better themselves, not just patch up, patch here, patch there, a bill, amend here and change the wording here, change the wording there, but expand so that the people and the people responsible within the communities, the councils and the community leaders can access, can have some direction that they can take to be able to expand their level of living, expand the fact that there is a need.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I will make a few comments on the bill itself, and as always, you sort of wonder when the minister, whether it be the Northern Affairs minister (Mr. Downey), whether it be the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), always says that we would like to present these few minor changes, minor changes to amend, to do this or do that.

I think this government and the ministers opposite, when they are going to make amendments to any bill, should look further than changing a little bit of language, changing a sentence here and a sentence there and providing words for people to dwell on.

Some of the bills that we have had presented before us here are so minuscule to the fact that they are not really dealing with the whole realm of the problem. The problem is that there is a great need out there and a great need in northern Manitoba, a great need in rural Manitoba, and is this government doing its fair share of participating with the northern communities and rural communities to get these northern communities moving and giving them the access to allow them, to assist them, in promoting the future of economic development, the future of better roads, the future of access to services. They keep dealing with one little problem here this time, another little problem next time, another problem here, another problem there—patchwork—instead of dealing with the issues and working for a whole, changing the act so that communities would be able to do more than just patchwork within their area. I feel that is the way to go, but it seems like this government and this minister want to just patch

things up and just keep things moving along so that there would be something else to do for them in the next session, or wait instead of dealing with it when the time is there to deal with it.

Certain comments, Madam Deputy Speaker, from the act that seem to show that the minister is thinking on the fact that, well, perhaps there is a lot of extra work for the communities and the councils within the existing act, and feels that some of the changes are going to assist them in achieving certain things for their communities, but we have to also probably look at some possible implications for the amendment. One aspect of the bill, interpretation of the bill, that I would see is that communities can assume a certain amount of control over the development of land located both within and surrounding their boundaries. Well, you do not want to, I feel, give total control away.

You have to have some say as to how Crown lands or property within the communities are being used. You have to have input from the community leaders as to what is best for their communities and what is best for their areas to be able to develop, to be able to put some roads in, to be able to get some residential development, to be able to build community halls, to do many things in a community that would benefit.

I feel that local community councils should have—you cannot just take away something from these people who represent their communities, who are representing the people within their communities, to better develop the living conditions and education conditions within the community. You have to have consultation. These people have to be able to be provided with an access so that they can have a say in what is going to go on within their community. You cannot just say, well, here we go. We are going to leave it up to the minister to decide this or the minister to decide that because the process is there or whatnot, and we cannot just leave that, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have to say, well, sure, in certain situations because of the system as it is, with the bureaucratic timetable and bureaucratic work that has been done in the past and perhaps somewhat in the near future, we have to in certain situations allow the communities and the community leaders to be able to access the right to be able to come through with a project, or a road or whatever it may be, with some expediency, with some haste so that the community people are not waiting for years and months at a time wanting a

project to go through because of all the bureaucratic system.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I mean it seems that on one hand you are saying, well, we are here to help you out, and on the other hand, you are saying, well, there is a limit to how we are going to help you out.

I also would have a feeling that I would be careful on how this amendment to The Northern Affairs Act will reflect on renewals of Crown land permits in and around the northern communities without the consultation. It would seem that again, on the one hand, the minister is saying, well, we are going to try and help you out by speeding up the system on one hand, and then on the other hand, he is saying, well, without consultation as to renewal of Crown land permits, it is going to be like an unweighted balance.

**An Honourable Member:** A pendulum.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** Pendulum, if you want to say.

Madam Deputy Speaker, getting back to fact of the specific needs in northern communities, I feel that there is always going to be a need for certain services and a need for housing. I feel that the communities in northern Manitoba now are looking for that avenue to be able to improve their housing and their land development and their living conditions. I would hope that this amendment to this bill would in fact be a start to be able to allow this access for the northern communities.

\* (1600)

Community planning within these areas is difficult at most times. You need the resource for surveying. You need the resource to see whether people can acquire titles, whether the fact that an access road would be required, whether the need to upgrade the economic development within their community, so community planning is often a problem.

I do not want to see that this amendment and this minister, I do not want to see the fact that he is going to take away from these community people that access and the availability to them so that they can in fact receive the proper direction in which to take.

I would again like to embellish on the road situation, and particularly, as I mentioned earlier, that the road systems in most of our northern communities are unusable, if there are any there at all. I realize and understand to a point that northern communities, and we have the fact of winter roads, Madam Deputy Speaker, are another point in the matter that I feel between the Minister of

Transportation (Mr. Driedger) and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey). Continue with that program; continue with, I guess, the lead. Take the lead so that these northern communities have access to the winter road system. If they are not going to be able to deal with the situation in hand as far as providing all-year-round roads for these people, I would think that they would provide and keep on providing the transportation end of it, the road system, the winter road system so that these people can access services in the winter and continue to try and develop their own areas at least to a level that will accommodate and provide better services and provide better feeling for needs in the northern communities.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would think that the ministry of Northern Affairs in their wisdom prepare, if they are feeling that there is going to be money saved or money available for other projects, if the minister's amendments, as he says in his dialogue, should save money and that the present system is expensive and consumes a lot of time—I would hope that then the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) would use finances that are going to be made available, if they are, through what he wants to do partly in this bill, that he use it for training, for job training and for education within the northern communities, or use this money, turn it back over to develop the northern communities even further with economic development.

The minister says it is a good idea, and I am sure that he has thought about that. However, we do want to see some action on it. We do not want to see any money that the minister feels he is going to save by doing this and doing that for northern communities going right back in the general revenue and pay off the debt service.

**An Honourable Member:** You would not want to do that.

**Mr. Cliff Evans:** No, we want to see it thrown back into northern communities, back into rural communities. [interjection] Well, that is true. I mean, we are thinking along the same lines when it comes to that except that this government thinks, well, everything that we can save or possibly cut from somewhere else, we will throw back into general revenue. Well, sometimes that does not work. You throw it back to the communities. The money you say you are saving, if you say you are saving money, then put that money back into where you are saving it, back into the areas that you are

saving it, not into just general revenue where they can accommodate themselves in any which way.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like, to conclude, to say that I would like to see this Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) work alongside with the communities and community councils.

**An Honourable Member:** I would like to see that too.

**Mr. Clif Evans:** The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) says, I am sure we all would. But the fact of the matter is are we going to be? Is anybody going to do anything about it? [interjection] Well, I would, Madam Deputy Speaker, like to say that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) work alongside with people, consult with the people, do whatever is possible to be able to improve the conditions in rural and northern Manitoba so that they are able to provide for their people all the necessary services, all the necessary education, housing, roads, so that these people can start thinking of the future and be able to progress to a level that we would all like to exist in.

I would say to this minister and encourage this minister to not only stop here with these few amendments but to go further within the Department of Northern Affairs to do what is necessary to be able to provide for the people in northern communities with again a life that we should all be accustomed to.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I will be very brief, but I would like to put a few comments on Bill 5, The Northern Affairs Amendment Act—[interjection] Nothing usually, coming from the Tories.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the majority of the changes that are in this bill, after discussion with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), it is strictly housekeeping. I think there should have been a lot more meat in this bill in regard to the northern people—[interjection] Pardon?

No, I think there have been a lot of comments made in regard to the North on housing, road conditions. It is true, people who have travelled up north know what it is—[interjection] Yes, I have travelled up north. I have lived up north, I have lived in Thompson, I have lived in Bissett and I remember very well coming out the first time. I was one of the first ones to come out on the road from Bissett to

Pine Falls in 1958. It is just a few years ago, but it shows that I have lived up north and I have worked with the people—[interjection] Sure I did. In those days you did not need a driver's licence.

It was interesting, it was an early part. I remember just flying into Bissett and I did not know what I was going into. I went to work for the San Antonio Gold Mines up there in the office. It was great, beautiful country, fine people to work with, and then I went there in the fall and came out in the spring and, like I say, it was the first time. There used to be, it was a winter road before that, but then they had built a road during the winter and it was the first time it was going to be an all-weather road. I think it took us something like six or seven hours in early spring to come out of there.

In some of the other communities that exist today we see those roads, because I was up north in Norway House area a couple of years ago and winter roads, the road from Bissett to Wasagaming, when you realize what they have to go through and put up with, and then you look at the housing and I think all these things should have been addressed in this bill and make the people—[interjection] Well, we had a fine gentleman, the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans) speaking today and saying not to attack the other parties.

\* (1610)

I feel the same way because I like the friendliness of the people whom we deal with whether they are in the opposition or in government. I think we all owe respect to the members no matter in what party they are. Mind you, I will not always be nice because I have another resolution I would like to introduce and speak on and attack the people for what they did yesterday. That is okay. That will be another issue. On this one here, like I said, I would be very brief.

**An Honourable Member:** Will you be supporting it?

**Mr. Gaudry:** This bill, yes, we will send it to committee, and I think we should ask the people to come if they have amendments. They should make it public and have the people put their input into these. I think it is time. You talk about consultation here in your speech, Mr. Minister, and I think that is what has lacked with this government, consultation. They do study after study and that is not what we want. Consultation, consultation, yes, that is fine but I think you have to—[interjection] No, no, I mean

you consult but act upon the consultation after it has been given for the work that the people want.

I think we have to listen to Manitobans and work with Manitobans, but not study after study and not do anything with these studies. [interjection] Well, I am not so sure. I think they have had their fair share but the government of the day, I think, can say the same thing because we have seen a lot of studies and nothing has happened. [interjection] Who said shame on you? I am just stating facts here.

I have always said I had integrity, so that is part of my integrity here, to say what I feel. I am being honest when I say that. [interjection] No, no, I would never cross the floor, because the Liberals are on the way up now, especially if I am going to run for the leadership. [interjection] I think Kevin is doing a good job too, so there is big competition out there.

I am looking at Subsection 9(2.1), which has been added and I was not too sure why, but looking at what the minister had to say in regard to it, he says, "We have added, Mr. Speaker, subsection 9(2.1) to establish the existing process in legislation. A failure to do so would require repetitive consultation and give the volume of Crown land permits issued in northern Manitoba." He talks about repetition. Well, I think they do that very well.

As a result of this section, the minister's approval will not be required for a renewal of a permit of occupation or use. It seems to me that according to the strict reading of the act, the minister should not have to give his approval. Maybe someone took issue with this and it needed clarification in the act. I do not think this is an issue, but perhaps the government will enlighten us in committee on this.

**An Honourable Member:** You shall be enlightened.

**Mr. Gaudry:** Yes, but it takes you time. It should have been done here without any problem when you introduced the bill.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the act also changes "letters patent" to "articles of incorporation" throughout. This is just in keeping with the current practice and does not seem to me to be anything other than housekeeping. As I said, the meat of the amendment appears to be in the changes of Section 10 of the act: If consent or approval of the PUB is required, the consent or approval of the minister may be substituted.

That is a good idea, because the minister's approval should be substituted once in a while, maybe more often.

**An Honourable Member:** Substitute the minister.

**Mr. Gaudry:** The member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans) says substitute the minister. Maybe that is another solution to the Northern Affairs problem.

**An Honourable Member:** What are you talking about, Neil?

**Mr. Gaudry:** I have not started on you yet.

If the PUB is there to make an independent, nonpartisan decision with respect to the northern municipalities, why is the government taking away the power of this body? Should the North have the benefit of the expertise of the PUB to make a decision without government influence?

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I say, it is just a housekeeping bill, and I think maybe there should be more into this bill. I am sure there will be amendments that will be brought forward. I think we should consult and process the consultation and implement what our northern people want in regard to helping them out.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I will conclude here. There will be nobody else speaking on behalf of the Liberal Party. We will send it to committee, and we look forward to debating this in committee and having the input from the northern communities. Thank you very much.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

**Motion agreed to.**

### **Bill 8—The Insurance Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 8 (The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances), standing in the name of the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 10—The Farm Lands Ownership Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 10 (The Farm Lands Ownership Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la propriété agricole et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickers).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 11—The Regional Waste Management Authorities, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 11 (The Regional Waste Management Authorities, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant les offices régionaux de gestion des déchets, modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 12—The International Trusts Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 12 (The International Trusts Act; Loi sur les fiducies internationales), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 13—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 13 (The Manitoba Employee

Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba), standing in the name of the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 14—The Personal Property Security and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 14 (The Personal Property Security and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi concernant les sûretés relatives aux biens personnels et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

### **Bill 16—The Public Schools Amendment Act**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To resume debate on second reading of Bill 16 (The Public Schools Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

**An Honourable Member:** Stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

What is the will of the acting government House leader?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Acting Government House Leader):** I believe, Madam Deputy Speaker, if you canvass the House, there may be a will to call it six o'clock.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? [agreed]

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).



# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Wednesday, March 10, 1993

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Presenting Petitions

Implementation of No-fault Auto Insurance  
Ashton 893

#### Tabling of Reports

Annual Reports: Rural Development;  
Conservation Districts of Manitoba  
Derkach 893

#### Oral Questions

PANDA Project  
Doer; Stefanson 893

Gemini Reservation Systems  
Doer; Stefanson 894

Port of Churchill  
Reid; Downey; Driedger 895

Income Security—Financial Assistance  
Carstairs; Gilleshammer 896

Department of Family Services  
Carstairs; Gilleshammer 896

Community Development Branch  
C. Evans; Derkach 896

Grow Bonds Office—Altona  
C. Evans; Derkach 897

Decentralization  
C. Evans; Derkach 897

Dairy Quotas—Amalgamation  
Wowchuk; Findlay 897

Manitoba Farming Community  
Wowchuk; Findlay 898

Headingley Jail  
Edwards; Manness 898

Economic Policies  
L. Evans; Manness 899

Manufacturing Investment  
L. Evans; Manness 900

Private Investment Spending  
L. Evans; Manness 900

Manitoba Intercultural Council Act  
Barrett; Mitchelson 900

Manitoba Intercultural Council  
Barrett; Mitchelson 901

Bill 16—The Public Schools Amendment Act  
Plohman; Vodrey 901

#### Nonpolitical Statements

Margaret Speechly Stansfield  
Memorial Award  
McIntosh 902

World Indoor Championships  
for Track and Field  
Cerilli 902

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Second Readings

Bill 15, Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act  
Stefanson 903

#### Debate on Second Readings

Bill 2, Endangered Species Amendment Act  
Maloway 905  
Cerilli 911

Bill 5, Northern Affairs Amendment Act  
C. Evans 917  
Gaudry 920